DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 717 SO 026 025

AUTHOR Saxe, David Warren
TITLE Curricular Issues in Social Studies: An Historical Perspective.
PUB DATE Jan 96
NOTE 82p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Course Content; *Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Problems; Curriculum Research; Elementary School Curriculum; Elementary Secondary Education; History Instruction; *Program Content; Secondary School Curriculum; *Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS American Historical Association; National Council for the Social Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper retraces the early development of the social studies curricular pattern of the 1920s and the subsequent division between social studies advocates, represented by the National Council for the Social Studies, and history-centered supporters, represented largely by the American Historical Association. The document maintains that the historical examination of the disputes over social studies issues sheds a needed perspective on current debates in the field and may help to break the lingering impasse between social studies advocates and history-centered supporters. This essay examines disputes over curricular issues in social studies from the 1910s to the 1960s when the debates over substantive issues begin to stall. The paper advocates an historical examination of the first cycle of social studies debates to reveal a great deal about the nature and practice of the field. Contains 160 references. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 392 717

CURRICULAR ISSUES IN SOCIAL STUDIES: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

David Warren Saxe
Associate Professor
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
The Pennsylvania State University

January 11, 1996

SO 026 025

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David Warren Saxe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Curricular Issues in Social Studies: An Historical Perspective

Since the 1920s--when social studies curricular patterns began to take root in public schools--, school curricula have varied and often vacillated between applications of social studies models and history-centered programs. The initial result of attempts to implement one model in place of another has been the creation of sharp divisions between social studies advocates (represented largely by members of the National Council for the Social Studies) and history-centered supporters (represented largely by members of the American Historical Association).

The examination of disputes over social studies issues reveals a Hegelian-like cycle that sheds a needed perspective on current debates in the field and, more hopefully, may help to break the lingering impasse between social studies advocates and history-centered supporters. In review of disputes over curricular issues in social studies the locus of the various debates moved from the initial development of the social studies idea to a model of citizenship education that conflicted with the prevailing paradigm centered on history study (this shift is exemplified by the early standoffs between social studies advocates and history supporters). In the wake of the curricular dissonance created by the entrance of a rival paradigm (generated by the NEA's 1916 Committee on the Social Studies), concessions and attempts at accommodations were made between social studies

workers and the American Historical Association. After unsuccessful attempts to reach a compromise, NCSS members began to cultivate programs that in effect worked to oust existing AHA models. In response, the AHA fought hard to put down the curricular rebellion brought on by social studies by vigorously supporting its well developed agenda for schools.[1] From this point in the 1920s and 1930s attacks were launched from all sides with periodic and largely gratuitous attempts at reconciliation. Thus the cycle of debates over social studies began as the original conception of the field squared off with prevailing theory and practice, and, since at least the 1960s, arguments over social studies issues have evolved into a series of largely polemical exchanges.[2]

This essay will examine disputes over curricular issues in social studies from the 1910s to the 1960s, when, I argue, debates over substantive issues began to stall. Although the faces had changed, those involved with the "new" arguments of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, began to retrace the same curricular turf without much improvement in theory or practice. Since the 1960s, a host of social, political, and economic issues have visibly changed the character of American life and deeply

effected schools. For example, to many debaters chronology-based history versus contemporary-based history remains a hot issue, while challenges to a coherent school life such as teenage pregnancy, gender inequities, drive-by shootings, drug abuse, and more, remain outside the curricular mainstream. Although this essay signals the need to recognize the impasse between social studies advocates and history-centered supporters as well as the need to bring fresh critical approaches into curricular debate, we also need some understanding of where past debates over citizenship education have brought us. In searching out this understanding, an historical examination of the first cycle of social studies debates reveals a great deal about the nature and practice of the field.

(1) Curricular debates in social studies typically signal shifts in approaches toward content and/or purpose, new models, innovations of program, application, and assessment. In addition, reform initiatives highlight changing political positions; frequently raising fundamental questions on teaching and learning. For example, should social studies be project or problem centered, be student-centered or more history/discipline-centered? Perhaps social studies should adopt a present focus or

be more holistic?

(2) In a very real sense debates over curriculum convey a great deal of information about what was taught in schools. When the substance of the various debates are compared to the production and revision of curriculum materials, in particular textbooks, it is clear that groups such as the American Historical Association (1899, 1911, 1921, 1934); the National Education Association (Madison Conference 1893, 1911, 1912), (Dunn 1916); and the National Council for the Social Studies (1934, 1942, 1951) have exerted an enormous amount of influence over schools. If we accept the notion that textbooks served as the official curriculum for social studies courses (and we have good reason to believe this), then how textbooks were created and revised becomes a critical element in examining social studies (Root 1958; Fitzgerald 1979). Through the examination of curricular debates we can also gain insight into the nature and practice of textbook publishing, textbook adoption, teacher education programs, school curricula, and testing and measurement activities.

(3) Perhaps the most revealing or confusing factor is that debates in social studies have highlighted the diversity of

proscriptions, definitions, rationales, and delimitations found in social studies. Is it social studies is or is it social studies are? Is social studies a field of study? A unique academic discipline or specialty of education? A sub-field of history, geography, or social science? Anything and everything connected to resolving social problems? A means to acquire the skills of responsible decision making? The study of persistent social issues? Should we agree with Edgar Bruce Wesley's (1937) often repeated description of social studies as the "social sciences simplified for pedagogical purposes," or should we succumb to the notion that social studies is simply a ragtag collection of pedagogical nonsense? In sum, the examination of social studies debates helps us to get at issues of definition, delimitation, and purpose; to answer questions like "just what is social studies and what purposes can we assign to this amazingly resilient curricular chameleon?

The context of the first debates: From social welfare to social studies

The development of social studies as a school subject

originated from the efforts of social welfare advocates, early sociologists, and social scientists whose work reflected the conviction that education and law were the primary instruments of positive social change (Saxe 1991). Before social studies entered school curricula it passed through four significant phases from: (1) a means to eliminate or reduce social problems in general, (2) to a universal form of education for all citizens throughout life, (3) to a broad-based social education program for all schooling (the notion of adjusting all school curricula to serve social purposes), (4) to a single curricular area of schooling devoted specifically to citizenship education.

The embryonic social studies passed through the first three stages between 1857 (the advent of the British-based National Association for the Promotion of Social Science devoted to solving social problems and furthering the social welfare issues and causes) and roughly 1912 (the appointment of the NEA Committee on the Social Studies) when social studies emerged as a program of citizenship education designed expressly for the secondary curriculum (7-12). The Committee's version of social studies was broad and flexible. As they worked to bring a definition of social studies into focus, the committee stipulated

that:

1. all subjects had to contribute to "social efficiency,"
2. individuals should be "trained" as members of society,
3. individuals should "participate effectively in the promotion of the social well-being,"
4. the "conscious and constant purpose [of social studies] is the "cultivation of good citizenship,"
5. "social studies should cultivate a sense of membership in the 'world community,'"
6. "high national ideals and an intelligent and genuine loyalty to them should be a specific aim of social studies,"
7. studies from each of the social studies (history, geography, civics, sociology) should be explored and applied (no single discipline or group of discipline should be the focus of teaching, and finally,
8. in making "no detailed outline of courses," the Committee determined that "the selection of topics and the organization of subject matter should be

[assigned] in each case by immediate needs (Dunn, pp. 9-10)."

The Committee introduced a social studies that was to be flexible and experimental, not fixed. Moreover, social studies was to be inclusive of all subject areas related to the human condition, not to be centered on a single perspective or subject area. Most importantly, giving social studies a perpetual contemporary texture and function, the Committee held that social studies was to work toward solving real-life social problems, toward helping children learn and practice citizenship skills for present life, not the learning or inculcation of information for some projected future adult life.

The First Debates: Snedden's Attacks on History

Before the publication of the 1913-1916 Committee on the Social Studies reports, the most significant voice for the embryonic social studies was David Snedden (1907, 1912, 1914). Snedden, a self-styled school administrator, helped to lay the groundwork for social studies entrance into national debates by

insisting on the ouster of the prevailing individualistic citizenship education (centered on history as an intellectual necessity) in favor of a more socially responsible schooling. Through his many lectures, articles, and books Snedden pushed the intellectual argument (at the national level) from a broadly defined socially-centered education in all subjects for all students toward a more focused and modest social studies education devoted to citizenship.

Although traditionally minded historians did not wish to square off with Snedden, administrators, staggered by the effects of massive immigration and searching for ways to deal with the very real challenges of day-to-day urban schooling, were eager to hear his views on such novel ideas as tracking students and the appropriate division of curricula. To Snedden (1914), an elite number of students were to be selected as potential leaders, to be indoctrinated into the proper "social conduct,"

> . . .including submission to established political order, cooperative maintenance of the same, and a great variety of social qualities which we sometimes designate as the social virtues, or moral worths (p. 279).

Snedden's idea was that children assimilate or adopt outright these "good" values identified by teachers. Snedden argued that his actions followed the dictates of modern societies that required indoctrination of appropriate and necessary social values.

The best documented showdown between Snedden (1914) and the history camp occurred at a meeting of the New England History Teacher's Association in May of 1914, where the featured presentation was a debate between Snedden and historian George L. Burr (1914) of Cornell University on the issue of "What history should be taught in high schools?" Delivering the first paper, Snedden argued that whatever history was included in schools it must not be the old "cold storage" variety, whose primary purpose was to train the intellect. Of equal importance, Snedden insisted that any history so placed "because some particular group of people fancied that their [history] introduction into the curriculum would be worth while (1914, p. 277)" should also be eliminated. In identifying his aims for history, Snedden claimed that social needs and problems should determine the content and purpose of history in the school curriculum. To

Snedden, this meant a history that offered the "facts of social development." This socialized history obligated teachers to "train its youngest members as to make them fit to carry on [sic] group life (p. 280)." In effect, Snedden tied the content and purpose of his history to present social life where accountings of medieval and ancient life had no real place in the modern school..

In defense of traditional approaches to history (historical objectivity, chronology based, intellectual rewards), Burr talked of the virtues of knowing about Louis Philippe and Guizot, the Bonapartes, Plutarch's Lives, Goths and Visigoths, Huns and Vandals, Greeks and Romans, and more. That the "favorite reading of men of action everywhere" was history; that "the very essence of history is life (p. 285)." Burr conceded to many of Snedden's criticisms of history (to make it more interesting, exciting, and useful for students), but he was "not so sure that [he] could go with Dr. Snedden all the way"; to place the whole of history on the "life of the present (p. 286)." To Burr, as has been the case with traditional historians throughout the century, to direct history study toward the present, and the present only, was to create a "history with all the history left out (p. 286)."

This case was asking too much of traditional historians; historians simply could not divorce themselves from associations with studies of the past. There was no room for compromise here and Snedden knew it.

Traditional History's Dilemma

At the time of Snedden's attacks on the AHA history program for schools, traditional historians were themselves dismantling links to social welfare/efficiency roots. Like the new discrete nature of sociology, political science, economics and other emerging social sciences, history, too, had been drifting toward status as a discrete field of study devoted to scientifically based research (historical objectivity). Interestingly, by the early 1900s, the evolving discrete social sciences were either eliminating or diminishing the status of historical components of their disciplines in favor of a more contemporary look. Consequently, experiencing dynamic change from outside and inside the profession, the evolving discrete nature of history ran counter to history as part of its earlier association or confederation with other subject areas devoted to solving social

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

problems and promotion of social welfare. That is, the individualist, intellectually elite nature of the AHA's version of citizenship was not easily reconciled to the social melioration purposes of the ASSA. To maintain leadership in citizenship education (that by 1900 had become merely a rhetorical goal for historians), historians had to give up the brand of history the field was moving toward (a socially aloof historical objectivity) and turn to a history the field had long moved away from (a field contributing to solving social problems).

After a decade of indecision a verdict was issued by the AHA's Committee of Five (1911): history was to stand pat, history instruction would not be altered to reflect social demands. With the Committee of Five's pronouncement, the symbolic door to school reform was opened for social studies, one of the few remaining educational ideas from the original ASSA 19th century social welfare agenda.

Enter the New History

Although traditionalists held the line on school history,

another group of historians had broken ground on a "new history" for the profession, whose applications carried broad implications for the teaching of history in schools. Under the leadership of James Harvey Robinson (a one-time traditionalist and member of the seminal 1892 Madison Conference of the Committee of Ten, and now leader of the "new history" movement) and his Columbia University colleague, Charles Beard, school history was rescued from the type of oblivion Snedden had wished for it. Robinson (1910, 1912) agreed with social education theorists: history had to become more useful to the "common man"; history had to be more than chronicles of ancient life; history had to become closely connected to modern life. Indeed, history study may begin in the past, but, as Robinson wrote, history must work to "explain our industrial life," not ignore it.

As you might suspect the New History movement created deep divisions within the profession, traditional historians treated the philosophy and works of the New Historians with contempt (for an account of these very bitter debates during 1910s see Novick, 1988). As Robinson, Beard, and later Charles Becker, James Shotwell, Arthur Schlesinger, and others, called for relevant social, cultural, and economic elements in historical accounts,

social studies theorists were quick to recognize and accept the New Historians into camp. Most notably, Robinson was added to the Committee on the Social Studies, where his "New History" was converted into social studies canon, and Beard, more the activist than Robinson, set out on the school lecture circuit to call for the ouster of the "old, four course" program of the AHA's Committee of Seven" (in favor of the New History and social studies).

Although Robinson's writings on the "new history" were widely cited by social studies advocates, Robinson himself (much like Dewey on social education issues) did not enter into any direct confrontations with other historians on the issue of "what history should be taught in schools." However, the zealous Beard did. At the 1913 fall meeting of the Association of History Teachers' of the Middle States and Maryland (AHTMSM)--(now the Middle States Council for the Social Studies)--, representatives of the three primary positions on "citizenship education" delivered papers: James Lynn Barnard (1913), NEA's Committee on the Social Studies; James Sullivan (1913), AHA's Committee of Five; and Charles Beard (1913), the new history.

Neither Barnard's or Sullivan's papers reflected the many

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

substantive differences between social studies and traditional history. In fact, the tone of both Barnard's and Sullivan's papers were conciliatory, not confrontational. Beard, however, delivered a rather harsh criticism of the AHA program, summarizing that his "method of solving the problem of [subject] overcrowding is a drastic one, deliberate eviction. Whenever the old four-year history schedule is in force, it should be cut." Continuing, Beard hammered the traditional program as "worse than a crime," it was an "educational outrage." After the paper session, respondents commented and proposed a number of questions for Barnard and Sullivan, but remained silent on Beard's paper; not one comment or question was reported.

For the next several years citizenship education was the major topic at meetings of the NEA, AHA, AHTMSM, and other related groups. Sometimes open discussions were held, however, typically, between 1913 to 1917, some member of the Committee on the Social Studies was pitted against an historian representing the AHA or, perhaps, with their antagonist absent, a paper was delivered sans opposition. Interestingly, although traditional historians acknowledged the presence of social studies as a curricular entity, most did not figure the upstart social studies

could possibly make any headway against the AHA program.

For example, in the 1915 AHTMSM meeting, historian William Lingelbach (1915) declared that despite "men like Mr. Kingsley [member of the Committee on the Social Studies and head of the overall Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education)," "who would apply the knife ruthlessly to all subjects. . ., [there was] very little evidence [or] real danger [that] history was losing ground [to social studies ideas]." In fact, Lingelbach continued, "the results of recent investigations all indicate that history is not only holding its own, but gaining ground." Lingelbach was, of course, correct, contemporary status reports (Gold 1917; Koos 1917; MacDonald 1907; Osgood 1914; and Stout 1921) did indeed demonstrate that the AHA program was supreme. Historian John Sutton argued that the AHA's Committee of Seven had provided schools with a system that was working with a "fair degree of uniformity." Adding the warning that any new committee on school history [or social studies applications of history] "would tend to destroy such uniformity as now exists; for some schools would follow the new recommendation, while others would abide by the old plan." Like Lingelbach, Sutton, too, was correct. Within a decade Edgar

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dawson (1924) reported that indeed one third of the schools followed the AHA, one third the 1916 social studies model, and one third a mixture of AHA's history and social studies, or some other unrecognizable program.

Despite its outward strength in schools, history was losing the rhetorical battle over control of citizenship education. At the 1917 AHTMSM annual meeting, one year after the release of the 1916 report of the Committee on the Social Studies, historian Henry Johnson (1920), then dean of the AHA's history in schools group, acknowledged that history had "suffered a relapse." Feeling confident that social studies was a misplaced idea, even an "absurdity," Johnson argued that the need to solidify America's resolve to fight a world war superseded any move to reform school curricula; that curriculum reform must "for the moment be ended" while energy was devoted to the "supreme purpose [winning the war] (p. 99)." Johnson (1920) went on to deliver a cogent assessment of the social studies movement, ending with his own outline of the ideal history program that must, at all costs, not be altered:

1. our facts must be historical and must be

recognized as historical,

2. facts must be selected and arranged from the standpoint of development [chronology], look[ing] primarily for interests and problems that shaped the past, and not primarily interests and problems now shaping the present,
3. we must strive for continuity, for history one and indivisible, one continuous, continuing process (pp. 225. 226).

The meeting ended without dissent; signaling that historians were closing ranks. Even Marshall Brown (Johnson 1920), President of the Middle States Association, commented upon closing the session that "the fact that [Johnson's points] have not [met with criticism] seems to imply that we have reached a consensus of opinion on [the position of history in schools] (p. 247)." The final word on history reform and social studies, however, was not made; the debating was only suspended until the war clouds dissipated.

History and Social Studies: A Working Compromise

By 1922, social studies had moved from a symbolic idea to an actual curriculum offered in public schools in at least five states (New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, North Dakota, and Minnesota). Other states and cities quickly moved to adopt social studies models that by 1924 Edgar Dawson, as mentioned earlier, reported that the citizenship curriculum was divided roughly into thirds: courses of traditional history, programs of social studies, and a collection of curricula too diverse to classify. This "confusion of tongues," as Dawson called it, necessitated the imposition of some curricular structure.

Early in the decade social education activists Earle and Harold Rugg, together with other like-minded social educators formed the National Council for the Social Studies in 1921 for the expressed purpose of furthering the cause of social studies in schools. While some discussion was generated as to what the form and function this new organization was to adopt, the first formal constitution of the NCSS (1923) reflected a spirit of openness as found in the final report of the Committee on the Social Studies. The operative clause of the brief one-page

Constitution (1923) begins:

> II. OBJECT The purpose of this organization is to promote the association and co-operation of teacher of the social studies and of school administrators, supervisors, teachers of education, and others who are interested in obtaining from the social studies the maximum results in education for citizenship. The National Council will especially undertake to stimulate and encourage study and investigation, experiment and research, concerning problems of teaching the social studies; and to serve as an agency for disseminating information and promotion of discussion in a scientific spirit, but without endorsing any particular program of studies or pedagogical method (p. 343).

Although history remained a strong component of school curricula (Dawson 1924; Koos 1927; Monroe & Foster 1922; Shiels 1922; Stout 1921), NCSS leaders were looking to promote whatever combination of courses that might provide "the maximum of results in education for citizenship." As noted in its constitution, the NCSS opened the possibility for new combinations of the social

studies, but the new organization had also opened the door on the notion of cultivating a social studies program.

During the 1920s, for history advocates, at least, the introduction of social studies moved from outside the curricular circle, to a euphemistically titled "allied courses of history," to the acknowledgment that "social studies" was the primary vehicle for citizenship education in schools. During the last year of the Great War, presumably dissatisfied by their own Committee on the Social Studies report, the NEA petitioned the AHA's National Board for Historical Service (the Government's official propaganda organization on historical issues related to the War) to revisit the status of history in schools. The AHA responded by organizing a Committee on History and Education for Citizenship, directed by historian Joseph Staffer. In 1920, the CHEC presented their report to the AHA for approval. After review, the AHA council refused to accept the recommendations, however, they did permit the findings to be published in The Historical Outlook (AHA 1921). Although reasons for the rejection were not recorded, apparently traditional historians remained in control of school policy and this group was not prepared to permit any adjustment of history curricula to reflect

social studies ideas.

During the 1920s debates over citizenship education between social studies theorists and historians on ideological or political grounds took on a decidedly different character than that of the early decade. From the founding of the NCSS in 1921 to the formation of the AHA's Commission on the Social Studies in 1929 (that represented historians' tacit acknowledgement that social studies introduction into school curricula as a fait accompli), historians and second-generation social studies theorists (like the Rugg brothers) demonstrated a strong willingness to work toward a consensus on needed reforms in education.

Another significant change during the period was the development of social studies as a fusion of courses (this approach was hinted at by the Committee on the Social Studies as well as the NCSS). Reporting in the first Yearbook of the NCSS (1931), Howard Wilson credits Harold Rugg with originating the fusion course (Social Science Pamphlets,) that Rugg and his Ginn associates later revised and published as the Rugg Textbooks in the Social Studies (first volume published 1929). Wilson held, however, that the "amalgamation of social subject matter" was

"only the surface aspect of 'the fusion idea.'" To Wilson, what was truly revolutionary about the fusion course were its "underlying principles." In review of fusion courses in a variety of settings (Conners 1928; Gambrill 1923; Hatch & Stull 1926; Rugg 1926; Stone 1922) including Rugg's celebrated Lincoln School, Wilson (1931) concluded that fusion courses practiced three "basic principles":

> First, all seem to be based on the belief that only such social-science material shall be utilized for teaching purposes as has direct, functional value in training pupils for the socio-civic activities of current living. Second, such functional material, once selected, is organized for teaching purposes in "natural units of learning, [also in projects]" in lifelike and problematic topics for study. The third principal is a corollary of the first and second, and demands the abolition of "subject lines" because "subjects" as such introduce much non-functional material into the curriculum, omit some valuable material, and prevent the organization of the curriculum in to "natural units" (p. 118).

Setting a seed for future debate, because such critics as Arthur Bestor in the 1950s and Dianne Ravitch in the 1980s made much of the idea of social studies as "social stew," it is important to note that the advent of social studies as a fusion course is distinct from the founding notion of social studies as a federation of discrete courses (a distinction not made by either Bestor or Ravitch).

During the 1920s the breakdown of traditional subject matter boundaries reflected an uneasy, but new found spirit of experimentation among teachers, administrators, and academics. However, the fallout due to 1929 stock market crash brought new and serious challenges for Americans including the start of a new round of debates over citizenship education. Like all institutions, schools were called upon to address the many problems created by the national depression. What were its causes? How can these problems be solved? What should citizens do to prevent such disasters? What should schools do? What kind of citizen should schools be producing? With all the problems associated to the Great Depression some educators began to ask, Do we "dare" to "build a new social order" through schools? The

latter question was, of course, that of the irrepressible social reconstructionist, George Counts.

Counts, Charles Beard, and the Commission on the Social Studies

By the time Counts (1932) delivered his provocative message to the Progressive Education Association, social studies (as opposed to the AHA history-centered version) had survived a number of theoretical transformations. From a theory of schooling founded in the realism of Herbert Spencer (ASSA), to the beginnings of logical positivism (Small 1906; Ward 1883), to an early progressive-pragmatic approach (Dunn 1915), to the experimental-progressive views of Rugg (1929), to the direct inculcation of social welfare theory (Counts 1932).

As a social reconstructionist, Counts was, of course, allied to both progressive principles and pragmatic philosophy. As an active promoter of social and political change (see Stanley 1992, Kliebard 1986, Saxe 1991), the direction that Counts would have liked for social studies was a departure from the Dunn-Dewey version that held that the cultivation, practice, and acceptance of independent critical thinking was the best approach to social

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

problems. Instead (or rather as a complementary move), Count's social studies sought to activate teachers and students as direct instruments of social change. That is, although social improvement was a goal, the earlier Dunn-Dewey social studies of 1916 did not seek to tamper with the institutions, customs, and practice of society. Counts and the reconstructionists, however, believed that schools and other social institutions should be fundamentally changed to reflect a more democratic (and socialist) character (see Stanley 1992). In particular, Counts called upon schools, as primary institutions for the inculcation of proper social, political, and economic values, to reflect social welfare dispositions and action in attending to identified social inequities and economic disparities.

Counts' found an outlet for his interest in schools through his work on the AHA's Commission on the Social Studies and from his many associations with his esteemed colleague Charles Beard. Acting as Director of Research for the Commission, Counts worked very closely with Beard (Counts often referred to Beard affectionately as "Uncle Charlie") while preparing Commission policy, operations, and reports. The AHA's Commission was an outgrowth of the 1926 AHA Report of the Committee on History and

Other Social Studies in Schools, chaired by historian August Krey. Krey, who may be described as a traditional historian who only donned social studies clothes when necessary, recommended that a five year commission be sponsored by the AHA to resuscitate what the Committee perceived to be the ailing social studies movement. More accurately, the Krey Committee recognized the spread of curricular experimentation and exploration in social studies as chaotic, not healthy curricular growth. In effect, the Krey suggestion was still another attempt by the AHA to seek the return and reassertion of curricular control over citizenship education policy and practice.

Under a generous grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the AHA sponsored the Commission to address in detail all aspects of the social studies in schools. Between 1932 and 1941, seventeen volumes were produced, the first of which was Beard's *A Charter for the Social Sciences in Schools* (1932). Although Beard did not chair the Commission (Krey retained this post), Beard did chair the critical sub-committee on objectives. In this capacity, Beard suggested authors, reviewed manuscripts, directed policy, and in general, became the Commission's chief spokesman. In addition to the *Charter*, Beard also authored *The Nature of the Social Sciences*

Issues in Social Studies (1934a), as well as, collaborated with Counts on the Commission's *Conclusions and Recommendations* (1934b).

Despite all its glitter, for schools, the Commission was a failure; much heat, but little light. Without a definite scope and sequence or specific suggestions for adoption of the Commission's social theory (derived primarily from Counts), teachers found little to apply directly in schools. The structure and resources of public schools did not easily permit the conversion of schools from academic centers to essentially training camps for social activism.

Although critics were divided on what was wrong with the Commission, their message was clear: the Commission's work was flawed. Snedden, that old nemesis of AHA school policy, again, because of Commission's continued devotion to passive subject-matter, found the work of the AHA's Commission a "very unpromising contribution to the cause of civic education (1932, p. 360)." Others like curriculum pioneer Franklin Bobbitt (1934) rejected the Commission's final report for its slavish attention to socialist and "collectivist" social theory. One critic sharply repudiated the Commission's "Conclusions" as a complete disregard for prevailing educational research; that the

Commission failed to apply "extensive statistical studies [and] controlled experimental investigations. . . to verif[y] results of its [own work]. . . [t]he result is this unrealistic volume that adds nothing to our knowledge about education (Haggerty 1935, p. 283)." Dissension even existed among the Commission as four members refused to sign the final report.[3]

Largely because the AHA was not prepared to tackle school history, social studies remained by decade's end as a strong contender for the catbird seat of citizenship education. Despite organizational problems by 1937, the NCSS (supported in part of the AHA) managed to developed its own journal *Social Education* and began to produce specialized social studies bulletins and yearbooks. Within twenty years of the report of the 1916 Committee on the Social Studies, social studies, as an emerging field, sported a wide number of curricular models. Although the traditional AHA history program (of the 1899 Committee of Seven) still continued in many schools as did the 1916 Committee on the Social Studies' Problems of American Democracy Course, a number of new applications and variations of the 1916 Committee on the Social Studies such as supervised study, the laboratory plan, the Dalton Plan, the Winnetka Plan, unit work, fusion courses, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Morrison Plan, the Project Method, topical applications, and socialized projects were found in schools across the nation.

Given the stimulating atmosphere of social studies as a curricular experiment, no matter how exciting or successful the program, the tenuous, undirected nature of social studies remained a problem for educators.[1] Simply put, how do you bring order to a field of study that outwardly adopts as its basic tenet speculative and tentative practices? In seeking to rescue social studies from the failure of the Commission to produce a viable program of study, the NCSS, guided by James A. Michener, directed 15 social studies authors to make "a sustained effort to bring some order into a confused field. . . a picture of what several scholars envision the future [of social studies] to be (Michener 1939, p. 4)." Michener's final work as an NCSS editor and Director of Publications, *The Future of Social Studies* (1939), exemplified the spirit of social studies as an experimental curriculum. Again, as did the seminal social studies program during WWI, the gathering clouds of a second world war halted the expanding possibilities of social studies. Within the first few years of the 1940s, the embryonic character of social studies was immeasurably altered by two events that shadowed America's entry

into war: the campaign to ban Harold Rugg's social studies textbooks and the vicious attack on social studies by historian Allan Nevins.

Banning the Rugg Textbooks

From the late 1920s to the early 1940s, Harold Rugg authored one of the most popular social studies textbook series ever used in public schools. However, as the Rugg texts were increasingly targeted by critics as "anti-American," sales began to fall from a peak in 1938 of nearly 300,000 copies per year, to less than 21,000 copies sold in 1945 at which time Ginn (publisher) halted printing and distribution (see Winters 1968). In the history of social studies there is no better example of a text series's success and subsequent failure.[5] What had happened to the Rugg books?

During the 1930s a concerted campaign was launched against what was perceived to be a very real threat to American life: totalitarian dictatorship. The campaign was directed against propaganda from the fascist governments controlled by Hitler (Germany) and Mussolini (Italy), as well as, Stalin's

socialist/communist regime (Soviet Union). Another primary concern during the decade was, of course, the conditions of life that reflected the Great Depression. What was especially perplexing for Americans was the contradiction between America's economic realities as found in the Great Depression and America's educated, skilled, and able populations, its great natural resources, its diverse markets, and its industrial capacity and potential. How was it possible for a nation that possessed great industrial power, who could feed and clothe itself as well as the world, to have more than one-quarter of its work force unemployed, for its population to experience such extreme economic stress and burden? Educational leaders (as well as others) of the 1930s believed that because propaganda had its greatest effect on people during times of turmoil and uncertainty, educational programs had to respond directly to political threats on American life, as well as to prepare citizens to deal effectively with complex economic and social problems. Rugg tackled these dilemmas in his texts.

In the process of analyzing America's political, economic, and social structures and processes, Rugg and his social studies colleagues George Counts, Charles Beard, and Paul Hanna (among

others) argued for the freedom to prepare and present social studies from an activist's based in opposition passive academic preachings.[6] How could Americans begin to solve social and economic problems without the ability to question systems, policies, institutions, customs, traditions, and/or individuals who may have been responsible for, or at least contributed to the Nation's deep economic and social problems? The direct examination of social and economic problems was a critical, though understated element of the Committee on the Social Studies (particularly through the two recommended courses Community Civics and Problems of American Democracy. In following the theoretical roots of Dunn's committee, Rugg took seriously the responsibility placed upon educators to bring issues, especially such controversial issues as race relations and social inequities, sex, economic disparities, and political challenges into schools. In bitter irony, it seemed that the more one worked as an advocate for freedom, the more one became a target as an enemy of democracy; as if free thinking and healthy skeptical attitudes were somehow alien to liberal-democratic principles.

Rugg's texts came to exemplify the paradoxical clash between

freedom and control. Indeed not all educators (or citizens, for that matter) agreed that critiques on established American values and traditions were justifiable or even appropriate; real patriots of democracy did not question democracy. That is, critiques on foreign (as in from another nation) fascist and socialist systems were necessary and acceptable, but critiques on American political and economic systems allegedly responsible for either economic depression or social injustice were held to be anti-American and anti-capitalist. Some defenders of democracy argued that even those adaptations that appeared to critics as elements of fascism and/or socialism in American life (tax laws, national park systems, social security, and a host of New Deal projects) should not be touched. Nonetheless, although many teachers defended the Rugg series (including John Dewey), school boards, caught in the hysteria of the times, acted to remove the controversial books (see, Carbone, 1977). Even Rugg's eloquent defense, *That men may understand* (1941), that appeared largely after the fact, did little to restore the series to schools.

The legacy of the Rugg Social Studies texts was that freedom, inquiry, and experimentation had limits, even within a declared liberal-democratic republic. Perhaps Rugg was far ahead

of his times in his social theory, perhaps the implications of his work touched too close to America's powerful political and economic elites. Nonetheless, Rugg had read his times; he identified the undercurrents and problems of American society and understood well that America had the promise to "produce in the next generation a golden age of abundance, democratic behavior, and integrity of expression (1939,[7] p. 27)." The "Great Society," that Rugg wished for America (idealized by the next generation), had to be created by individuals who understood what Rugg called "The American Problem": "[h]ow to organize [citizens] into a going national concern that will produce economic abundance, democratic behavior, and creative expression (p. 27)." Rugg and his associates ably presented and supported the social reconstructionist position in texts. However, they were unable to overcome the attacks from the patriots of traditional values.

With Rugg and his fellow social reconstructionists subdued and in retreat during a time when the need to garner the sort of practical and intellectual unity necessary to fight a world war, historian Allan Nevins, redrafting the old traditional history position, worked to fill the leadership void in citizenship education. To Nevins an experimental social studies was

shamefully unsuited for America's needs, and only a return to a history-centered approach could prepare citizens to face the realities, demands, and challenges of modern life.

Nevins and Hunt: Social Studies vs. History. . . Again!

The exchanges between Columbia University historian Allan Nevins (1942b), representing the interests of traditional history, and Erling M. Hunt (1942b), a Teachers College professor who also served as editor of the NCSS's official journal *Social Education* (representing social studies), were important footnotes to the debates over citizenship education, rather than substantial contributions to curricular reform. The controversy over Nevins' charge that college and university students lacked a basic knowledge of American history, served to illustrate two primary points: (1) that wide differences and misunderstandings continued to exist between traditional historians and socials studies advocates; and (2) that professional relationships between historians and social studies advocates had been reversed (historians now stood on the outer edges of curricular control, rather than at center).

Nevins' critiques on the teaching of American history in schools, which started with his May 1942 New York Times Magazine article, quickly involved social studies advocates. From May 1942 through 1945, historians, educators, and citizens reacted to Nevins' indictment (on both sides of the issue) through a number of editorials, letters to editors, and journals. In addition, the Nevins-Hunt exchange also spawned two major surveys of students' knowledge of American history (New York Times Survey (April 1943) and the Report of the Committee on American History (Wesley 1944). The debate between Nevins (1942b) and Hunt (1942b) began with Nevins' charge that schools were failing to provide even "a full year's careful work in our national history (Nevins 1942a)." As Hunt pointed out in his response, Nevins' statement was not prompted by an examination of contemporary status reports of school history, but by data that identified the number of states that required, by law, the teaching of American history. Finding that 22 states of 48 failed to require American history, Nevins, gravely concerned, called for an immediate "inquiry, reproach, and action," against those responsible. Hunt found this demand absurd, especially since Nevins hinted that social studies was somehow at fault. Countering, Hunt (1942a)

asserted that

> [Nevins] makes the very obvious error of confusing the mere taking of courses with the process of learning--an error repeated by those who have subsequently joined the campaign he started. He--and they- go on to assume that the ignorance of American history which we all deplore lies in the quantity of teaching that is done, that it can be remedied by simple statutory requirements. The diagnosis is wrong. The difficulty lies rather in the quality of our American history teaching (p. 250.).

As Hunt (1942a) carefully pointed out, Nevins[5] grossly misunderstood the nature of public schooling: that American history was often repeated three times in schools (grade 5, 8, 11); that schools in those states that did not by law require American history typically offered the course anyway; that American literature (a course found in all states) contained a healthy dose of American history; that few students entered college without taking American history; and finally, that students rarely retained the type of detailed information that

Nevins considered essential American history (to be able to know that "Polk came before Pierce, Irving before Herman Melville, or McCormick before Alexander Graham Bell, (p. 250)." Given Hunt's reaction, Nevins requested the opportunity to respond. Hunt obliged by providing the editorial pages of *Social Education* for an exchange between himself and Nevins in the December 1942 issue.

Admitting that his own investigation into the problem had led him to "understand why many pupils of New York and New England refer[ed] to social studies, very deplorably, as "social slush," Nevins clearly identified social studies as the guilty party, and, by implication, social studies and history teachers. Ultimately, Nevins did not retract any of his earlier statements and Hunt, having the last word, heavily criticized Nevins for his naivete and misrepresentation of the relationship between social studies practice and history content. Answering Nevins point by point, it was clear from the tenor of Hunt's response that Hunt was closing the case on Nevins.

In the following spring the dispute was reopened when the New York Times (1943), on its front-page, reported the results of a survey of some 7,000 college students' knowledge of American history. On first glance the results supported Nevins; it was

obvious that students did not know their American history. However, acting again as chief arbitrator of citizenship education in theory and practice, Hunt (1943) dismissed the survey and Nevins. Although Nevins had wished to put social studies advocates on notice that historians were not going to tolerate any further subversion of history, it was clear that historians had lost the locus of curricular control.

During a critical period of American history Erling Hunt's rationale for social studies carried the day. Americans dealing with economic depression, social injustice, war, the horror of the Holocaust, the first hints of a Cold War, the dawn of nuclear power--all complex human events and tragedies--required a forward thinking curricula. The founders of social studies had developed the notion of contemporary curricula, but the powerful, sweeping events of the 1930s and 1940s demonstrated the need for social studies. Social problems had grown too complex, too broad, the pace of change too quick, the dynamics of growth and the potential for destruction too great; only a flexible, broadly conceived experimental curriculum grounded in liberal-democratic principles could prepare citizens for life in the modern world. Where Nevins rightfully raised the consciousness of Americans on

knowing about the past of the United States, given the backdrop of world events, Hunt's argument simply made better sense. From the mid-1940s, social studies (through the National Council for the Social Studies) became ensconced organizationally and theoretically as the representative voice of citizenship education; any reformation of national curricula would have to seek approval from the NCSS or ultimately challenge its curricular authority.

Behind the able leadership of Erling Hunt, the NCSS through special bulletin and Yearbook publications tackled social, economic, and political problems head on. Another important result from the Nevins-Hunt exchange was the forming of the joint Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges sponsored by the AHA, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the NCSS under the direction of social studies professor, Edgar Bruce Wesley (1944).

Seeking Common Ground: The Wesley Committee

The formation of the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges was sparked as much by the fallout of Nevins' pronouncements as by the well publicized report of the National Association of Manufactures (1941). Finding that a number of social studies textbooks (including history textbooks) either did not present or did not adequately provide positive images of American government or the Nation's economic system, the NAM study raised the issue of the desirability of limiting "academic freedom" in school texts. In answer to these challenges, the joint Committee raised the question "Do Americans know their own history?" Unlike the detailed New York Times survey that assessed the simple recall of discrete and often isolated facts, Wesley (1944) and his associates designed an assessment instrument to explore a student's ability to interpret data, synthesize diverse historical accounts, and demonstrate an "understanding of relationships." Wesley (1944) argued that

> an examination which requires merely the recall of specific but infrequently utilized information is not only difficult

> [to retain for recall], it is also of equivocal and uncertain significance. Specific facts are forgotten far sooner than principles, applications, generalizations, and relationships. . . [For instance], [i]t is a gratuitous assumption that the inability to identify the frontier line of 1860 demonstrates complete ignorance of the westward movement. . . The forgetting of details is not a virtue. In fact, the retention of them is highly desirable, for there is a positive correlation between the recall of specific information and the ability to use it (p. 2-3).

The Wesley test sought to "sample" an individual's "knowledge of American history," not "measure a person's entire knowledge of American history." In addition, the Committee highlighted that the test was designed to assess "the recognition of correct information," not merely "the recall of information"; to compare the achievement of a particular individual against the achievement of other individuals of similar educational background, accomplishment, or age. The test was administered to five different groups of individuals: high school seniors, servicemen, persons noted in Who's Who in America, social studies

teachers (K-12), and selected adults.

The Committee reduced the problem in the teaching of history to the observation that "humans beings learn slowly and forget quickly." Those who scored the highest (social studies teachers and Who's Who persons), the Committee reasoned, had done so because of a greater sustained exposure to "studying history, reading the papers, listening to radio programs, reading historical novels, or seeing historical films (p. 13)." In sum, it wasn't lack of instruction alone or even poor quality instruction or materials that led to low scores on the American history test, the problem rested with incomplete and scattered experiences. The Committee acknowledged that no "magic formula" for "fix[ing] the content of American history in the minds" children existed, yet, if students were given repeated exposure to history material that was "interesting, timely, and pertinent" success would follow. The Committee cautioned, however, that for students to understand American history, a student must also come to terms with connections to "geography, economics, sociology, government, and particularly world history (p. 13)"; American history alone was not sufficient for modern citizenship. Moreover, simply

> passing a law ordering Americans to know their history, prescribing a unit of American history. . ., liquidating professors of education, or abolishing objective tests are not solutions to the problem of developing an understanding of American history (p. 13).

As the immediate crisis or embarrassment over American history passed, social studies educators turned toward exploring and developing new approaches to citizenship education, particularly a more broadly defined international citizenship, tempered, of course, with a healthy dose of American history.

Arthur Bestor

As problems of military conflict, Cold War tensions, and domestic issues unfolded in the early 1950s, Arthur Bestor renewed the traditional historian's attack on social studies. Directly appealing to the history establishment, this new argument for history's return to the curricular spotlight was far more potent than Nevins. Nonetheless, however cogent Bestor's argument for history, again, world events proved more powerful

than words. In the context of the spread of communism, the threat of nuclear war, and the surprise of Sputnik, rather than ushering in a renewed commitment to academic history study in schools (that Bestor wished for), ironically, Bestor was to witness the beginnings of a new age of social science teaching in schools known as the "New Social Studies."

Unlike Nevins, Bestor had a better grasp of the nature of social studies in practice and theory. As a child, Bestor had attended Lincoln School, Teachers College during the 1920s just as Rugg and his associates were introducing fusion social studies. Later, although he was never fond of social studies and was trained as an historian, Bestor once served on the faculty of Teachers College, ironically teaching history within the Rugg's vaunted Department of Social Studies. Despite his misgivings about social studies, at first, Bestor was very active in the Middle States Council for the Social Studies, serving as editor of its official Proceedings 1938-1942. In schools, Bestor realized that so-called social studies courses did not outweigh history offerings and that many so-called social studies teachers actually taught history. Although Bestor called for a national organization for history teachers in schools (in opposition to

NCSS), he acknowledged that historians had lost their curricular control over schools and that history reform might have to be channeled through the NCSS (see Boozer 1960).

Still, in the manner of Charles Beard, who sought the outright "eviction" of traditional history from schools in the 1910s, by the 1950s Bestor was arguing forcefully for the ouster of social studies and social studies advocates (whom he often referred to as "anti-intellectual educationists"). In the educationists' place, Bestor called upon the "scientific and scholarly community" to take over the nation's schools (see Time Magazine, January 5, 1953). Alluding to Winston Churchill's "iron curtain" speech, Bestor wrote

> [a]cross the educational world today stretches the iron curtain that the professional educators have fashioned. Behind it, in slave-labor camps [schools], are the classroom teachers, whose only hope of rescue is from without. On the hither side lives the free world of science and learning, menaced but not yet conquered. . . (1952, p. 114)

Shortly after Bestor launched his attack on educationists

(and social studies educators is particular), historian William Cartwright (1954), NCSS spokesman Erling Hunt, and a host of other "educationists" marshalled forces against him (see Alilunas (1958), Boozer (1960), Bolster (1962). As Bestor quickly found out, the restoration of historians to curricular authority in schools could not, of course, be accomplished merely by a verbal barrage, even an intense campaign of words. Bestor's attacks through his speeches and back-room tactics in AHA circles, his many articles in popular journals and magazines, and his two well publicized books Educational Wastelands (1953), and Restoration of Learning (1956), did much to stir interest in schools, but these attacks ultimately alienated teachers and often disregarded or diminished positive educational accomplishments. Even Bestor's history colleagues were unsure about history's return to curricular authority. At Bestor's suggestion, the AHA did authorize a new Committee on Teaching History in the Schools, however, the Committee's mandate was not to be on Bestor's terms. Rather than a committee to reopen the issue of scope and sequence, rationale and aim, from the professional historian's perspective (that Bestor called for), the new AHA committee sought to cooperate with school administrators and teachers in

finding more effective approaches to citizenship education through the use of "Service Centers for Teachers" and a new series of history pamphlets.

Although the Service Centers (Cate 1965) generated interest among teachers, as a rule, teachers who attended were not interested in pedagogy or method (they knew how to teach), what interested teachers was content: What was new in history (content)? Thus, it was new scholarship in history, not a return to the pre-1900 rationale for history in schools that was important to teachers. As Arthur Bolster (1962) pointed out, the traditional historian's dictum that "no one who is unfamiliar with all major world developments since 4,000 B.C. can be a competent citizen; or that a study of the past is uniquely and simultaneously able to produce lifelong commitment to certain values and consistent use of the skill of critical judgement" was long outdated (p. 63).

Toward the New Social Studies: Ending the first cycle of debates

In response to Bestor's well developed attacks, the NCSS emphasized the need for cooperation with social scientists

(including historians) for bringing cutting edge scholarship into citizenship education for the coming space age. Although the 1958 NCSS Yearbook New viewpoints in the Social Sciences (Price 1958) illustrated the willingness of the NCSS to include social scientists, it was obvious that some of the invited social scientists did not understand the nature of schools and learning. As the NCSS demonstrated the need to include social scientists in curriculum planning, the field was drifting away from its own history. Arguing that the 1916 pattern for social studies was unsuited for children who would witness "the landing of the first United States astronaut [sic] on the moon," the NCSS, oblivious to the elastic character of social studies that had served the field through four decades of curricular reform, sponsored a joint project between NCSS and social scientists of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS/NCSS, 1962). The invited pieces, representing each of the social sciences and history, were presented as discrete (and not necessarily connected) elements of social study. Rather than pointing toward a cohesive, but loosely constructed social studies, the joint project served to illustrate the coming of a new period of curricular chaos for social studies.

As the 1960s began, in joining the broader "revolution" in schooling initiated in the sciences and mathematics, NCSS leaders sought out partnerships with sociologists, political scientists, economists, anthropologists, and, of course, historians for NCSS Yearbook and special bulletin publications. In addition, building off the ideas of Jerome Bruner (1960), another line of social studies workers sought to explore the teaching of social studies through "inquiry," "critical thinking," "concepts," and "decision making" approaches. Adding to the excitement (and confusion) of curricular possibilities for social studies, when government funds (National Science Foundation)[3] became available to investigate social science applications in schools, a third avenue of social studies reform was set into motion dubbed the "New Social Studies," a term that has come to include all of what went as social studies reform in the 1960s.

As these reforms in social studies were well underway, the rubric social studies was again attacked as unsuited for modern citizenship education. The new attack, led by historian Charles Keller (1961), called for a "revolution" in teaching of social sciences and history comparable to other contemporary curricular changes in the sciences, math, reading, and foreign languages.

Despite Keller's plea, a residual of Bestor-like critics (Mayer 1963), and other pressures placed upon NCSS to change social studies, the term remained ensconced within curricular discussion and products. Social studies as an idea, however, underwent yet another exciting, but unfortunately predictable metamorphosis: with significant reforms in content and method that failed to relate to classroom teachers and students, with curricular changes that bred further confusion among teachers and students, with transformations that created interesting, but ultimately dysfunctional social studies patterns that many teachers and students found either too difficult to apply or irrelevant to their particular needs, interests, or capacities.[10]

What was interesting about the New Social Studies was that theorists and practitioners at the National level were well aware of the revolution they were creating, but few understood the need to push for curricular unity and consensus amid the revolution (for exceptions, see McCutchen 1963; Shaver 1967; Wesley 1965). A prime example of this shortcoming occurred at the Cranbrook Curriculum Conference (Bauer 1966). Among those debating social studies reforms were Charles Keller, Evans Clinchy, Edwin Fenton, John Good, and Fred Newmann, however, only Newmann recognized the

importance of "identifying and molding the commonalities of social sciences [New Social Studies] into a form of citizenship education (p. 66)." Simply put, the revolution was not moving toward Newmann's consensus, but toward other more divergent views. Acknowledging that social studies "improvement no longer required much defense" (a point hotly disputed in many quarters today), James Becker (1965), an executive officer of the influential North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, captured the essence of the work that led to the New Social Studies Movement.

> The social studies have been surveyed, inventoried, studied, analyzed, criticized, and reported on enough, and from different points of view, that it seems safe to say that no new views of their present state are likely to be forthcoming (p. 20).

Becker's finality, that nothing new could possibly be said about social studies, illustrated the attitude that further debates about social studies were unnecessary. Becker (1965) beseeched curriculum developers and school administrators

[teachers were left out here] to "quit expecting some *one* right way to revise the high school social studies to come out of the blue, and get underway with whatever modest experimental projects they are able to devise (p. 31)." Becker's solution was that teachers should apply what was known and what knowledge was being generated by social scientists.

Becker had reduced the problem of social studies as one of transferring content knowledge to students; that as more and more knowledge was created what was needed was new and improved methods of delivering content. Becker described the "best" model for social studies (as a means to deliver content) as one that was "experimental, flexible, and responsive to local control." Becker was, of course, completely ignorant that these three elements were precisely the basic tenets of Dunn's 1916 Social Studies program for activating social welfare policies. Without an historical orientation or foundation, without a tradition of social studies thought and practice, social studies was, again, being reinvented by another generation of well meaning theorists and practitioners. Despite its successes (see, Fenton & Good 1965; Fraser 1965, Haas 1977), the rootlessness of the New Social Studies--that social studies was more related to the acquisition

of discrete facts and skills, than a purposeful exploration and practice of civic competence--did not engender meaningful reform in schools.

Becker's conclusions that nothing more could be said about social studies helps to illustrate an end of the first cycle of debates between history-centered supporters and social studies advocates. In claiming that everything worth debating had been debated, Becker was not able to recognize the enormity of the civic rights movement, the stirring of the women's rights movement, or the effect these two issues would have on citizenship education. In addition, although environmental concerns were raised, writing in the midst of the 1960s, Becker could not have factored in the unprecedented fall of communism, the rise of terrorism, end of the Vietnam War, the computer revolution, Watergate, or even the effect of MTV on youngsters. Although we still attend to such issues as whether our history should be focused on the present or whether our history should be chronological, what is important for present and future discussion is that <u>new</u> questions are being asked of our curricular efforts in citizenship education. For example, in debates since 1900 through the 1960s, all parties assumed that

the history of United States was the history of how Europeans conquered the continent. The issue of "whose history" should we study and from what perspective (European, Native-American, Afro-American, or others) was simply not raised, the issue was not even considered by the differing factions.

Some parties in recent debating efforts work from old paradigms, when clearly the field has changed. Not to lump all the following into categories of equal importance, but questions on such controversial issues as abortion, gay rights, parenting, violence, gender equity, immigration, discrimination, and more are issues that have been raised in our society and they are issues that directly impact the nature of citizenship education. Whether we wish to ignore these issues or not, the existence of these concerns signal the beginning of a new wave of debates over social studies curricula.

Conclusion

Hopefully this article has opened new and old doors to a set of fundamental questions about citizenship education. The examination of debates helps to get at the thorny issues of what should be taught: the old standards of history, geography, and civics? Courses in social sciences? Combinations of discrete core areas? Integrations of core areas that fuse discrete cores into holistic models? Digging even deeper, what history and geography (or perhaps whose history and geography) are we to teach about? European? Non-Western? Afrocentric? Moreover, how shall we define the parameters of instruction: for example, if history, then should the history be chronologically based? Present based? Work backward? Used to explain present problems? If not history, then what?

Questions of skills and dispositions are also important. Should we promote skills that lead students to cultural literacy? historical perspective? and geographic competence? Should we convey messages that underscore attitudes or positive feelings toward American patriotism and/or support for government or community action? Should we support social studies instruction

that is aimed to reduce or eliminate racism and exploitation of women? Should we advance issues of equity and justice for all citizens?

What this essay has labored to illustrate is that although we should move ahead in debating curricular issues, we should also come to terms with the historical context of social studies issues. While this examination of curricular debates in social studies present answers to many of the above questions, and I do not mean to depreciate the sincere efforts of reformers, most of the recent history-social studies exchanges between individuals such as Diane Ravitch (1989) and Ron Evans (1989), Paul Gagnon (1990) and Steven Thornton (1990a), Claire Keller (1991) and Jack Nelson (1992) together with initiatives from groups such as the California Department of Education (1988), National Commission on Social Studies in Schools (1989), Bradley Commission on History in Schools (1988), and the National Council for History Education, have in many cases simply rehashed old arguments.

In contrast, as exemplified in the works of Molefi Asante (1991), William Bigelow (1991), Dinesh D'Souza (1992), Kieran Egan (1983, 1990), Carol Gilligan (1982), Henry Giroux (1988), Amy Gutmann (1987), E. D. Hirsch, Jr. (1987), Leonard Jeffries

(1988), Rush Limbaugh (1992), Camille Paglia (1991), Diane Ravitch (1987a, 1987b, 1989), Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (1992), Kenneth Strike (1991), and William Stanley (1992), new issues have been placed on the table together with new ideas, new patterns, and new paradigms of thought that now challenge prevailing notions of citizenship education. As these issues begin to mix with more established views and practice in social studies, a renewed, more vital and fruitful round of debating should emerge.

References:

Academic Freedom Committee. (1991). Academic freedom and the social studies teacher. *Social Education*. 55(1), 13-15. [Official position statement of the National Council for the Social Studies, originally published 1969]

Alilunas, L. J. (1958). Bestor and the "Social Studies." *Social Education*. 22(5), 238-240.

American Council for Learned Societies. (1962). *Social studies and the social sciences*. (Sponsored by the American Council for Learned Societies and the National Council for the Social Studies). New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

American Historical Association. (1934). *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission*. Report of the Commission on the Social Studies. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

American Historical Association. (1921). Report of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship. *Historical Outlook*. 12(3), 87-97; 12(4), 119-143; 12(5), 165-189; 12(6), 208-218.

American Historical Association. (1909). *The study of history in elementary schools*. (Report of the Committee of Eight).

New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

American Historical Association. (1899). *The study of history in schools*. (Report of the Committee of Seven). New York: Macmillan.

American Historical Association. (1911). *The study of history in secondary schools*. (Report of the Committee of Five). New York: Macmillan.

Asante, M. K. (1991). Afrocentric curriculum. *Educational Leadership*. 49(4), 28-31.

Axtelle, G., & Wattenberg, W. (Eds.). (1940). *Teachers for democracy*. 4th Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: Appleton.

Bacon, P. (Ed.). (1970). *Focus on Geography*. Washington, DC: National Council for Social Studies.

Barnard, J. L., (1913). The teaching of civics in the elementary schools. The Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland, *Proceedings*. 11, 46-47.

Barth, J. (1992). Future of the social studies. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of National Council for the Social Studies, Detroit, MI.

Bauer, N. (Ed.). (1966). *Revolution and reaction*. Cranbrook

Curriculum Conference. Bloomfield, MI: Cranbrook Press.

Beard, C. (1934b). *Conclusions and Recommendations*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Beard, C. (1932). *A charter for the social sciences in schools*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Beard, C. (1934a). *The nature of the social sciences*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Beard. C. (1913). Training for citizenship. Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland. *Proceedings*. 11, 53-58.

Becker, J. M. (1965). Prospect for change in the social studies. *Social Education*. 29(1), 20-22, 31.

Bestor, A. (August 1952). Aimlessness in education. *The Scientific Monthly*. 75, 109-116.

Bestor, A. (1953). *Educational wastelands: The retreat from learning in our public schools*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Bestor, A. (1956). *The restoration of learning*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Beyer, B. (1971). *Inquiry in the social studies classroom*. Columbus: Merrill.

Bigelow, W., Miner, B. & Peterson, B. (Eds.). (1991). *Rethinking*

Columbus. Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools.

Bobbitt, F. (1934). Questionable recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies. *School and Society*. 40(1025), 201-208.

Bolster, A. S. (1962). History, historians, and the secondary school curriculum. *Harvard Educational Review*. 32(1), 39-65.

Boozer, H. R. (1960). *The American Historical Association and the schools, 1884-1956*. Dissertation, Washington University.

Bradley Commission on History in Schools (1988). *Building a history curriculum*. (n.p.): Educational Excellence Network.

Briggs, T., & French, W. (1939). *Education for democracy*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Brubaker, D. (Ed.). (1968). *Innovation in the social studies*. New York: Crowell.

Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Burr, G. L. (1914). What history shall we teach? *History Teachers Magazine*. 5(9), 283-287.

California Department of Education. (1988). *History-social science framework*.

Carbone, Jr., P. (1977). *The social and educational thought of*

Harold Rugg. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Cartwright, W. (1954). What is happening in the social studies. *Social Education*. 18(2), 77-79; 18(3), 115-116, 127.

Cartwright, W., & Watson, R. (Eds.). (1961). *Interpreting and teaching American history*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Cate, J. (1965). *The 1965 history institutes revisited*. N.P.: American Historical Association.

Conners, W. L. (1928). The new social studies in the junior high schools. *Bulletin* Number 7, Cleveland Public Schools, pp. 9-22.

Counts, G. (1932). *Dare the schools build a new social order?* New York: John Day.

Cremin, L. (1961). *The transformation of the school*. New York: Knopf.

Cremin, L. (1988). *American education: The metropolitan experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

D'Souza, D. (1992). *Illiberal education*. New York: Vintage.

Dawson, E. (1924). The History Inquiry. *Historical Outlook*. 15(6), 254-258.

Dunn, A. W. (1915). *Civic education in elementary schools as*

illustrated in Indianapolis. (United States Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1915, No. 17. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Dunn, A. W. (1916). *Social studies in secondary education*. (A report of the National Education Association, United States Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1916, No. 28). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Egan, K. (1990). *Romantic understanding*. New York: Routlege.

Egan, K. (1983). Social studies and the erosion of education. *Curriculum Inquiry*. 13(2), 195-214.

Engle, S. (1964). *New perspectives in world history*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Evans, R. (1989). Diane Ravitch and the revival of history: A critique. *Social Studies*. 80(3), 85-88.

Fair, J., & Shaftel, F. (Eds.). (1967). *Effective thinking in the social studies*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Fenton, E. (1967). *The new social studies*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Fenton, E., & Good, J. M. (1965). Project social studies: A progress report. *Social Education*. 29(4), 206-208.

Fraser, D. M. (1965). Status and expectations of current research and development projects. *Social Education*. 29(7), 421-34.

Fitzgerald, F. (1979). *America Revised*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Gagnon, P. (October 1990). Rededication to social studies: What should be included? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies, Gettysburg, PA.

Gambrill, J. M. (1923). Experimental curriculum-making in the social studies. *Historical Outlook*. 14(9), 391-397.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H. (1988). *Schooling and the struggle for public life*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gold, H. H. (1917). Methods and content of courses in history in the high schools of the United States. *School Review*. 25(2), 99-100; 25(4), 281-82.

Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Haas, J. (1977). *The era of the new social studies*. Boulder, CO: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies and Social Science Education Consortium.

Haggerty, M. E. (1935). The low visibility of educational issues. *School and Society*. 41(1053), 273-283.

Hatch, R. W., & Stull, D. (1926). A unit fusion course in the social studies for the junior high school. *Historical Outlook*. 17(8), 371-374.

Hanna, P., Anderson, G., & Gray, W. (1936). *Curriculum foundations series*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman.

Hertzberg, H. W. (1981). *Social studies reform 1880-1980*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium

Hirsch, Jr., E. D. (1987). *Cultural literacy*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.

Hunt, E. (1942b). American history in democratic education. *Social Education*. 6(8), 346-353.

Hunt, E. (Ed.). (1962). *High school social studies perspectives*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.

Hunt, E. (1942a). More American history? *Social Education*. 6(6), 250-252.

Hunt, E. (1943). The New York Times test on American history. *Social Education*. 7(5), 195-200, 240.

Hunt, M. & Metcalf, L. (1955). *Teaching high school social studies*. New York: Harper, Row.

Jarolimek, J., & Walsh, H., (Eds.). (1969). *Readings for social studies in elementary education*. New York: Macmillan.

Jeffries, L. (1990). As quoted in J. Berger, (April 20, 1990). Professor's theories on race stir turmoil at City College. *New York Times*.

Jenness, D. (1990). *Making sense of social studies*. New York: Macmillan.

Johnson, H. (1920). Proceedings of the conference of teachers of history. American Historical Association *Annual Report* 1917 (pp. 220-26). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Jones, T. J. (1913). Statement of the chairman of the committee on social studies. In C. D. Kingsley (Ed.) *Preliminary statement of the chairman of the committee of the commission of national education association on reorganization of secondary schools.* (United State Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1913, No. 41). Washington DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Keller, C. (September 16, 1961). Needed revolution in social studies. *Saturday Evening Post*. pp. 60-62.

Keller, C. (1991). It is time to abolish the mythology that the

social studies constitute a discipline. *The International Journal of Social Education*. 6(2), 69-77.

Kliebard, H. (1986). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge.

Koos, L. (1927). *The American secondary school*. Boston: Ginn.

Koos, L. (1917). History and other social studies. *The administration of secondary-school units*. 1(3).

Kownslar, A. O. (Ed.). (1974). *Teaching American history: The quest for relevancy*. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Krug, E. (1964). *The shaping of the American curriculum 1880- 1920*. New York: Harper & Row.

Limbaugh, R. (1992). *The way things ought to be*. New York: Pocket Books.

Lingelbach, W. E. (1915). The content of the course in European history in the secondary schools. The Association of History Teachers of the Middles States and Maryland *Proceedings*. 13, 80-95.

MacDonald, W. (September 12, 1907). The situation of history in secondary schools. *The Nation*. 85, 225-26.

McCutchen, S. P. (1963). A discipline for the social studies.

Social Education. 27(2), 61-65.

McLendon, J. (1973). *Guide to reading for social studies teachers*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

McLendon, J. (Ed.). (1966). *Readings on the social studies in secondary education*. New York: Macmillan.

Massialas, B. G., & Cox, C. B. (1966). *Inquiry in social studies*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mayer, M. (1963). *Social studies in American schools*. New York: Harper & Row.

Metcalf, L. (1963). Research on teaching the social studies. In N. Gage, (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 929-965). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Metcalf, L. (Ed.). (1971). *Values education*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Michaelis, J., & Johnston, A. (Eds.). (1965). *The social sciences foundations of the social studies*. Boston: Allyn-Bacon.

Michener, J. A. (Ed.). (1939). *The Future of the Social Studies*. Curriculum Series, 1. National Council for the Social Studies.

Monroe, W. S., & Foster, I. O. (1922). *The status of the social*

sciences in the high schools of the North Central Association, Bulletin 13. Urbana: University of Illinois.

National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools. (1989). *Charting a course: Social studies for the 21st century.* Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1923). The Constitution of the National Council for the Social Studies. *Historical Outlook*. 14(9), 343-46.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1951). *Education for democratic citizenship.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1934). *The social studies curriculum.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1942). *Teaching of critical thinking in the social studies.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

National Education Association. (1911). Report of the Committee of Nine on the Articulation of High School and College. *Addresses and Proceedings* (pp. 559-567). Chicago: University of Chicago.

National Education Association. (1912). Report of the Committee on the Articulation of High School and College. *Addresses and Proceedings* (pp. 667-669). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

National Education Association, History Sub-committee Report. (1893). History, civil government, and political economy. In *Report on secondary school studies* (pp. 162-203). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

National Manufacturers' Association abstracts textbooks. (1941). *Social Education*. 5(2), 134-140.

Nelson, J. L. (1992). Premature announcement of the death of social studies. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Detroit, MI.

Nevins, A. (May 3, 1942a). American history for Americans. *New York Times Magazine*.

Nevins, A. (1942b). More American history?: A letter. *Social Education*. 6(8), 343-346.

New York Times. (April 4, 1943). History survey. p. 1, 32-33.

Novick, P. (1988). *That noble dream*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oliver, D. W., Shaver, J. P. (1966). *Teaching public issues*

in the high school. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.

Osgood, E. W. (1914). The development of historical study in the secondary schools of the United States. *School Review*. 22(7), 444-454; 22(8), 511-526.

Paglia, C. (1991). *Sexual personae*. New York: Vintage.

Price, R. (Ed.). (1958). *New viewpoints in the social sciences*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Ravitch, D. (1989). A revival of history: A response. *Social Studies*. 80(3), 89-91.

Ravitch, D. (1987a). Tot sociology. *American Scholar*. Summer, pp. 343-354.

Ravitch, D., Finn, C. (1987b). *What do our 17-year-olds know?* New York: Harper and Row.

Riddle, D., & Cleary, R. (Ed.). (1966). *Political science in the social studies*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Robinson, J. H. (1910). The significance of history in industrial education. *Education Bi-Monthly*. 4, 376-389.

Robinson, J. H. (1912). *The new history*. New York: Macmillan.

Root, E. M. (1958). *Brainwashing in the high schools*. Wheaton, IL: Devin-Adair.

Rugg, H. (Ed.). (1939). *Democracy and the curriculum.* 3rd Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: Appleton-Century.

Rugg, H. (1929). *An introduction to American civilization.* Boston: Ginn.

Rugg, H. (1926). A preface to the reconstruction of the American school curriculum. *Teachers College Record.* 27(7), 600-616.

Rugg, H. (1941). *That men may understand: An American in the long armistice.* New York: Doubleday, Doran.

Saxe, D. W. (1992). Framing a theory for social studies foundations. *Review of Educational Research.* 63(3), 259-277.

Saxe, D. W. (1991). *Social studies in schools: A history of the early years.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Schlesinger, Jr., A. (1992). *The disuniting of America.* New York: Norton.

Senesh, L. (1966). Organizing curriculum around social science concepts. In I. Morrissett (Ed.) *Concepts and structures in the new social science curricula* (pp. 25, 31). West Lafayette, IN: Social Science Education Consortium.

Shaver, J. P. (1967). Social studies: The Need for redefinition. *Social Education.* 588-592, 596.

Shaver, J. P., & Berlak, H. (Eds.). (1968). *Democracy, pluralism, and the social studies*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.

Shiels, A. (1922). The social studies in development. *Teachers College Record*. 23, 126-145.

Small, A. (1906). The relation between sociology and other sciences. *American Journal of Sociology*. 12(1), 11-31.

Smith, F. R., & Cox, C. B. (1969). *New strategies and curriculum in social studies*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Snedden, D. (1912). The Certification of teachers in the high school with special reference to certification in history. *History Teachers Magazine*. 3(5), 100-105.

Snedden, D. (1907). History as instrument in the social education of children. *Journal of Pedagogy*. 19, 259-268.

Snedden, D. (1932). Social studies-for what? *School and Society*. 36(925), 358-362.

Snedden, D. (1914). Teaching of history in secondary schools. *History Teachers Magazine*. 5(9), 277-282.

Stanley, W. B. (1992). *Curriculum for utopia*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Stone, S. I. (1922). The social sciences in the junior high school. *School Review*. 30(10), 760-769.

Stout, J. E. (1921). *The development of high-school curricula in north central states from 1860-1918*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Strike, K. (1991). The moral role of schooling in a liberal democratic society. In G. Grant, (Ed.) *Review of Research in Education, 17* (pp. 413-483). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Sullivan, J., (1913). Civics in the High School and training for citizenship. The Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland. *Proceedings*. 11, 49.

Sutton, J. R. (1916). The report of the committee of seven in relation to the proposed definition of the course. *History Teacher's Magazine*. 7(6), 207.

Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

Thomas, R. M., & Brubaker, D. (Eds.). (1972). *Teaching elementary social studies: Readings*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Thornton, S. (October 1990). Rededication to social studies: What should be included? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies, Gettysburg, PA.

Thornton, S. (1990). Should we be teaching more history? *Theory and Research in Social Education*. 18(1), 53-60.

Time Magazine. (January 5, 1952). Firing Wild. p. 52.

Tryon, R. (1935). *The social sciences as school subjects*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Ward, L. F. (1883). *Dynamic sociology*. New York: Appleton.

Wehlage, G., & Anderson, E. (1972). *Social studies curriculum in perspective*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wesley, E. B. (Ed.). (1944). *American history in schools and colleges*. New York: Macmillan.

Wesley, E. B. (1965). Let's abolish history courses. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 49, 3-9.

Wesley, E. B. (1937). *Teaching the social studies*. New York: D. C. Heath.

Wilson, H. (1933). *The fusion of social studies in junior high school*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, H. (1931). The fusion of social studies in junior high school: A critical analysis. *Some aspects of the social sciences in the schools* First Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies (pp. 118-31). Philadelphia: McKinley.

Winters, E. (1968). Harold Rugg and education for social reconstruction. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Notes:

1. The American Historical Association had provided curricular models for grades 1-12 (AHA 1899, 1909), however, the prototype social studies program was strictly for grades 7-12. This omission of K-6 models in social studies confirmed the history-based sequence for the lower grades. Social studies programs did not effectively move into the lower grades until Paul Hanna (1936) began his work with his "expanding communities of man" series in the late 1930s.

2. Because the historiography of social studies is only now growing, few extended treatments exist on the history of social studies. Beyond recent treatments by Hazel Hertzberg (1981), David Jenness (1990), and Saxe (1991), the last (and only) book length accounting of social studies was Rolla Tryon's work (1935). Among educational historians, outside of chapters by Kliebard (1986) and Krug (1964), we find nothing of substance on the past of social studies in any of major educational histories (see Saxe 1992); Cremin (1961, 1988) does not even acknowledge the existence of social studies.

3. Committee members Frank Ballou, Edmund Day, Ernest Horn, and Charles Merriam declined to sign the Commission's final recommendations.

4. James Barth (1992) recalled that the then ranking dean of social studies, Edgar Bruce Wesley, regretted that he did not attempt [during the 1930s] to end the curricular chaos of social studies, when he had the power to act.

5. My mother, who attended junior high school in Mountain Lakes [NJ] in the mid-1930s (where the Rugg books were eventually

banned), fondly remembers the participatory series that kept students actively involved in thinking and learning.

6. The National Council for the Social Studies activated a Committee on Academic Freedom that sought to protect teachers in the pursue of introducing honest discussion and skepticism in schools (see Academic Freedom Committee 1991). Unfortunately, for reasons not quite understood by this writer, recently the NCSS executive council voted to disband this once vital committee.

7. Rugg's brilliant *Democracy and The Curriculum* (1939), which he co-authored with Hollis Caswell, George Counts, Paul Hanna, and William Kilpatrick (among others), remains one of the most complete rationales on liberal-democratic education (see also Axtelle & Wattenberg 1940; Briggs & French, 1939).

8. Nevins position on history in schools is not entirely that of a disinterested ivory-towered professor. Not that it is a crime to drum up sales, but unlike Hunt, Nevins had in print school textbooks especially designed to complement (sell) his ideas on American history.

9. For a brief description and critiques of the sixteen programs of Project Social Studies see *Social Education* (April, October, and November 1965). For an interesting contemporary view of the social studies revolution see Smith & Cox (1969), Haas (1977).

10. For book-length representations of social studies in the 1960s and early 1970s see, Bacon (1970); Beyer (1971); Brubaker (1968); Cartwright & Watson (1961); Engle (1964); Fair & Shaftel (1967); Fenton (1967); Hunt et al. (1962); Jarolimek & Walsh (1969); Kownslar (1974); Metcalf (1963, 1971); McLendon (1966, 1973); Massialas & Cox (1966); Michaelis & Johnston (1965); Oliver & Shaver (1966); Riddle & Cleary (1966); Shaver & Berlak (1968); and Thomas & Brubaker (1972); Wehlage & Anderson (1972).